REMARKS

Claims 1, 12 and 21 have been amended as indicated above. Claims 1, 4-12, 16-21 and 24-28 remain in the application for consideration. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the application be forwarded on to issuance.

Examiner Interview

Applicant respectfully thanks the Examiner for the time spent on the telephone on March 6, 2007 discussing the disposition of this case with Applicant's representative. During the telephone communication, Applicant and the Examiner discussed the cited art, and particularly the reference to Scott. During the discussion, Applicant pointed out to the Examiner that Scott does not first apply a global screen and then, subsequently apply an individual screen. The Examiner appeared to be in agreement with this temporal aspect of Scott and agreed to reconsider the claims if amended to recite the temporality of the screening.

Examiner Williams agreed to call the undersigned representative before issuing a subsequent Office Action.

Specification Objection

The Specification has been objected to as not providing an antecedent basis for material that was previously added by amendment. While Applicant disagrees with the Office and specifically pointed to sections of the Specification that support the added amendment, this language has been canceled from the claims due in large part to the amendments that are presently made.

§112 Rejections

Claims 1-4-12, 16-21 and 24-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. This rejection also flows from language that was previously added, which is now removed. Again, Applicant's removal of the previously amended subject matter is not to be seen as an admission as to the propriety of the Office's rejection. Rather, such material has been removed in view of the amendments that are presently made. That is, given the Office's interpretation of Scott and the clarification that has been made in the claims, the previously-added subject matter is not necessary to defined over Scott.

§101 Rejections

Claims 21 and 24-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Office argues that the claims, as written, can pertain to carrier waves. Applicant has amended claim 21 to recite that the computer readable media is a "computer readable storage media". Support for this amendment can be found on page 17, lines 8-16 of the Specification.

§ 103 Rejections

Claims 1, 4-12, 16-21 and 24-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over David Scott and Richard Sharp, Abstracting Application-Level Web Security, May 7-11, 2002 (hereinafter, "Scott") in view of Wheeler, Secure Programming for Linux and Unix HOWTO.

Claim 1 (as amended) recites a method, comprising:

- receiving data input through a web page from a client device;
- referencing a declarative module to determine a client input security screen to apply to the data input from the client device, wherein the declarative module comprises:
- a global section that includes at least one client input security screen that applies to any type of client input value; and
- an individual values section that includes at least one client input security screen that applies to a particular type of client input value; and
- applying multiple client input security screens to the data input from the client device, including at least one client input security screen from the global section of the declarative module and at least one client input security screen from the individual values section of the declarative module, wherein the client input security screens are distinct from one another, ***and wherein said act of referencing comprises first using the global section to screen one or more client input values and then using the individual values section to screen at least one of said one or more client input values***.

This claim has been amended to recite that the act of referencing first uses the global section to screen one or more client input values and ***then*** uses the individual values section to screen at least one of the one or more client input values. Support for this subject matter can be found, among other places, on page 9, line 6 through page 10, line 20.

As discussed during the interview, Scott does not first use a global section to screen input values and then use an individual values section to screen at least one of the client input values. In point of fact, Scott would appear to teach directly away from any such notion. Specifically, the Office has characterized Scott's transformations as a "global section" and its validation constraints as an "individual value section". Yet, Scott instructs in section 3.4 entitled "The

Security Gateway" that the validation constraints are first employed (i.e. what the Office considers as the "individual value section") and then the transformations are employed (i.e. what the Office considers as the "global section").

Accordingly, for all of these reasons, this claim is allowable.

Claims 4-11 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from an allowable base claim.

Claim 12 (as amended) recites a system, comprising:

- a web page server unit configured to provide one or more web pages to one or more client devices over a distributed network;
- means for receiving client input data;
- a declarative module configured to include multiple client input security screens that declare screening rules for client input, wherein the declarative module comprises:
- a global section that includes one or more client input security screens that are applied to all types of client input; and
- an individual values section that includes one or more client input security screens that are applied to specified types of client input; and
- a client input security screening unit configured to apply the screening rules for client input to the client input data and to perform one or more actions on invalid client input data, wherein the screening rules are from distinct client input security screens from the global section and the individual values section, ***and wherein the client input security screening unit is configured to first use the global section to screen one or more client input values and then use the individual values section to screen at least one of said one or more client input values.***

This claim has been amended to recite that the client input security screening unit is configured to first use the global section to screen one or more client input values and then use the individual values section to screen at least one

of said one or more client input values. For all of the reasons set forth above with regard to the allowability of claim 1, this claim is allowable.

Claims 16-20 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from an allowable base claim, as well as for their own respectively patentable subject matter.

Claim 21 (as amended) recites one or more computer-readable storage media containing computer-executable instructions that, when executed on a computer, perform the following steps:

- serving a web page to a client over a distributed network;
- receiving client input via the web page;
- comparing the client input with multiple and distinct client input security screens stored in a security declarative module, wherein the security declarative module includes a global section configured to screen all types of client input values and an individual values section configured to screen particular types of client input values, ***wherein the global section is used to first screen one or more client input values and then the individual values section is used to screen at least one of the one or more client input values***;
- if invalid client input is detected, performing a screening action on the invalid client input as indicated by the security declarative module; and
- wherein the client input security screens included in the security declarative module can be applied to multiple web pages.

This claim has been amended to recite that the global section is used to first screen one or more client input values and then the individual values section is used to screen at least one of the one or more client input values. For all of the reasons set forth above with regard to the allowability of claim 1, this claim is allowable.

Claims 24-28 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from an

allowable base claim, as well as for their own respectively patentable subject matter.

Conclusion

The pending claims are in condition for allowance and action to that end is respectfully requested. Should any issue remain that prevents allowance of the application, the Office is encouraged to contact the undersigned prior or issuance of a subsequent Office action.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 3/15/2007

By: /Lance R. Sadler/
Lance R. Sadler
Reg. No. 38,605
(509) 755-7251